REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 14-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0157115) in view of Tsurumi (US 6,714,262), Sadanaka (US 6,751,197), Lecron (US 2005/0144646) and Prus (US 2005/0144651).

Claim 1 recites the features of a <u>device detector</u> for detecting whether or not said security device is mounted in said receiver; and a <u>second controller</u> for, when it is detected by said device detector that said security device is mounted in said receiver, (1) <u>extracting transmission information from the SI information extracted by said security device</u>, the SI information being transmitted with the FDC data, and (2) <u>receiving the broadcasting signal based on the extracted transmission information</u>. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest at least the above-noted combination of features recited in claim 1.

With respect to the above-noted features, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the Prus reference (US 2005/0144651) teaches "a device detector for detecting whether or not the security device is mounted in said receiver and steps to be performed if [the security] device is mounted" (see Office Action at page 5).

Regarding this position taken by the Examiner, Applicants note that Prus discloses the ability to determine whether a smart card mounted in a set-top box, wherein if it is determined

10

that the smart card is mounted in the set-top box, and the smart card responds with the correct override code, then an executable image from the smart card is loaded into DRAM 250, and subsequently, into flash memory 200 (see paragraph [0033]).

Based on the foregoing description of Prus, Applicants note that while Prus discloses the ability to determine whether a smart card is mounted in a set-top box, and to load an executable image from the smart card into the DRAM 250, and subsequently, into flash memory 200, if the smart card responds with the correct override code, that Prus does not disclose or in any way suggest the above-noted features recited in claim 1 which indicates that "when it is detected by said device detector that said security device is mounted in said receiver, (1) extracting transmission information from the SI information extracted by said security device, the SI information being transmitted with the FDC data, and (2) receiving the broadcasting signal based on the extracted transmission information."

With respect to the above-noted feature recited in claim 1 drawn to the functions that are performed when it is detected that the security device is mounted in the receiver, Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed this feature in the Office Action, but instead, has merely indicated that Prus discloses "steps to be performed if [the security] device is mounted" (see Office Action at page 5). In this regard, Applicants note that while Prus discloses steps to be performed if the smart card is mounted (i.e., load executable image from the smart card into the DRAM 250, and subsequently, into flash memory 200), that such steps do not in any way whatsoever correspond to the above-noted functions of "(1) extracting transmission information from the SI information extracted by said security device, the SI information being transmitted

11

with the FDC data, and (2) <u>receiving the broadcasting signal based on the extracted transmission information</u>", as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Prus does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 1 of a <u>device detector</u> for detecting whether or not said security device is mounted in said receiver; and a <u>second controller</u> for, when it is detected by said device detector that said security device is mounted in said receiver, (1) <u>extracting transmission information from the SI information extracted by said security device</u>, the SI information being transmitted with the FDC data, and (2) <u>receiving the broadcasting signal based on the extracted transmission information</u>. Further, Applicants submit that the remaining prior art references cited by the Examiner do not cure this deficiency of Prus.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

<u>If the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explicitly point out which information in the cited prior art references is being relied upon as corresponding to the claimed "transmission information", the claimed "SI information", and the claimed "FDC data", so that Applicant can make an informed decision with regard to appeal.</u>

Further, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended so as to recite that when it is detected by said device detector that said security device is not mounted in said receiver, and when said synchronization judgment unit judges that said first demodulator is synchronized with

12

the broadcasting signal, <u>extracting the transmission information on the broadcasting channel</u> <u>from the broadcasting signal</u> demodulated by said first demodulator, <u>and storing the extracted</u> <u>transmission information in a data memory</u>. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest such features.

For example, with respect to the Lu reference (US 2002/0157115), Applicants note that this reference discloses the use of a set-top box having a removable POD module 300 which is used for performing access and security functions which allow selective access to basic digital cable services (see paragraph [0027]). Accordingly, Applicants note that that while Lu discloses the use of a removable POD module 300 to perform access and security functions, that the mere use of such a POD module does not in any way correspond to the above-noted features recited in claim 1 which indicate that <u>when it is detected that the security device is not mounted</u> in the receiver, extracting <u>transmission information</u> on the broadcasting channel from the broadcasting signal demodulated by said first demodulator, <u>and storing the extracted transmission information</u> <u>in a data memory</u>.

In addition, with respect to the Tsurumi reference (US 6,714,262), Applicants note that this reference discloses the use of a de-scrambler 29 that reads a header of a reproduced TS signal to judge whether a synchronization pattern can be detected, wherein if it is determined that the synchronization pattern is detected, the de-scrambler sets a de-scramble synchronization flag F5 to "1" (see col. 6, lines 36-42). Accordingly, Applicants note that while Tsurumi discloses the ability to set a de-scramble synchronization flag to "1" if a synchronization pattern is detected, that such an ability does not in any way whatsoever correspond to the above-noted

13

features recited in claim 1 which indicate when the synchronization judgment unit judges that said first demodulator is synchronized with the broadcasting signal, extracting transmission information on the broadcasting channel from the broadcasting signal demodulated by said first demodulator, and storing the extracted transmission information in a data memory.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining prior art references cited in the Office Action do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Lu and Tsurumi. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 2-7, Applicants note that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 14, Applicants note that this claim has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 and recites the features of a second controller for: when it is detected by said device detector that the security device is mounted in said receiver, (1) extracting transmission information from the SI information extracted by the security device, the SI information being transmitted with the FDC data, and (2) receiving the broadcasting signal based on the extracted transmission information; and when it is detected by said device detector that the security device is not mounted in said receiver, when said synchronization judgment unit judges that said first demodulator is synchronized with the broadcasting signal, extracting the transmission information on the broadcasting channel from the broadcasting signal demodulated by said first demodulator, and storing the extracted transmission information in a data memory.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants

14

respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a combination of features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshikazu HAYASHI

By: _Kenneth W. Fields_
    Kenneth W. Fields
    Registration No. 52,430
    Attorney for Applicant

KWF/krg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 10, 2008

15